

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/008,947	01/20/1998	RANDELL L. MILLS	911322US	6830
7590 12/20/2007 FARKAS & MANELLI 2000 M STREET, N.W.			EXAMINER	
			KALAFUT, STEPHEN J	
7TH FLOOR WASHINGTO	N, DC 200363307		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1795	
			r	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<u> </u>	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/008,947	MILLS, RANDELL L.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Stephen J. Kalafut	1795			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address			
• •	DIVIO DET TO EVOIDE AM				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT atute, cause the application to become ABA	CATION. apply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3	0 October 2007.				
<u> </u>					
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-6 and 10-60</u> is/are pending i	n the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-6 and 10-60</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.	•			
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ a	accepted or b) objected to b	by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	= :	·			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		,			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
	 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 				
2. Certified copies of the priority docume3. Copies of the certified copies of the p		·			
application from the International Bur	·	eceived in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	received.			
	,				
Attachment(s)	_				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	4) Interview Su	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Inf	formal Patent Application			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 30 Oct 2007.	6)	_·			

09/008,947

Art Unit: 1795

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 30 October 2007 has been entered.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 10-60, for reasons of record previously applied to claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 10-59, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. See paper no. 17, paragraph no. 3.

Claims, 2, 4-6 and 10-60, for reasons of record previously applied to claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 10-59, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. See paper no. 17, paragraph no. 4.

Applicant's arguments filed 30 October 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

09/008,947

Art Unit: 1795

Applicant argues that Dr. Rathke has misrepresented Applicant's mathematical equations. Rathke cites Applicant's article from Int. J. Hydrogen Energy, "The grand unification theory of classical quantum mechanics", for the classical wave equation. The equation as shown in Applicant's article and by Rathke differ only in the characters inside the parentheses after "p", Where Rathke uses "x", Applicant uses "r", "θ" and "φ", the two differing only in the choice of coordinate system.

Applicant argues that the "Committee" has created a "new patentability standard" of acceptance by the scientific community, which it has imposed upon the Applicant. The relevance of "known scientific principles" and "contemporary knowledge" are found in MPEP §2107.01 and §2107.02, and are thus not created by the Examiner or any "Committee".

Applicant repeats his argument that Lieb disproves Krieg. Lieb does not reject the Heisenberg uncertainty principle entirely, but instead differs with an argument that is often based thereon. See page 555, left column, first two paragraphs. He states that "Eq. (4)" (which is on page 554), from the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, is correct, but "it is a pale reflection of the power of the operator $-\Delta$ to prevent collapse" (page 555, left column 4th paragraph). Lieb then offers the Sobolev inequality as a "better uncertainty principle". Nowhere, however, does Lieb ever allow for hydrogen atoms going below the conventionally known "ground state".

Please also see the attached Appendix.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen J. Kalafut whose telephone number is 571-272-1286. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00 am-4:30 pm.

09/008,947

Art Unit: 1795

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick J. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sjk

STEPHEN KALAFUT PRIMARY EXAMINED